

Minutes of the
MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options
Friday, May 16, 2003
Cholla Room

Members

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman
Charlie McClendon, Avondale
*Prisila Ferreira, Peoria

Norris Nordvold, Phoenix
Jim Huling, Mesa
Patrick Flynn, Tempe

Others in Attendance

Brian Townsend, Gilbert
Peggy Carpenter, Scottsdale

Amber Wakeman, Tempe
Harry Wolfe, MAG

* Not present nor represented by proxy

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m. by George Pettit.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of May 2, 2003

It was moved by Jim Huling, seconded by Charlie McClendon and unanimously recommended to approve the meeting minutes of May 2, 2003.

3. Revenue Implications of Using 2005 instead of Census 2000 Population to Distribute State-Shared Revenue

Harry Wolfe noted that the Subcommittee had requested an estimate of the revenue implications of using a 2005 population count instead of Census 2000 for distributing state-shared revenue. Drawing upon analysis conducted by the League of Arizona Cities and Towns, he discussed an estimate of the state-shared revenues allocated to member agencies using 2000 Census versus an estimate of 2005 population.

George Pettit asked if the total state-shared revenues was based upon the year 2000 revenues. Harry Wolfe responded that it was based upon the anticipated 2004 state-shared revenues.

Charlie McClendon commented that the 2004 state-shared revenues already reflected certain anticipated revenue declines.

Harry Wolfe said that the cost of the Special Census could be spread over fiscal years 2004, 2005 and 2006 at a rate of 15 percent, 5 percent and 80 percent respectively. Jim Huling asked if the FHWA funds could be used to absorb the share of the costs in FY 2004 and FY 2005 and that the member agency obligation be deferred to FY 2006. Harry

Wolfe said that he believed that FHWA would allow us to use their funds to front the costs of the Census survey, but that we would need to check again with FHWA.

4. Issues Associated with the Use of 2005 DES Resident Population Estimates for the Distribution of State Shared Revenues

Harry Wolfe noted that at the May 2, 2003, Subcommittee meeting it was requested that MAG staff provide a briefing on the issues associated with the use of a 2005 DES population estimate for distributing state-shared revenues. Mr. Wolfe gave a presentation on the process used to prepare the annual DES estimates, pointing out potential sources of inaccuracy.

Charlie McClendon noted that anomalies in the data collected – such as automobile licenses – would effect the accuracy of the estimates.

Other issues raised regarding the estimates included the currency of the data used, the potential for error in the statistical methods used and the inability to verify some of the data.

5. Overview of Relative Merits of Alternatives for Determining 2005 Population for the Distribution of State-Shared Revenues

Members of the MAG Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options discussed the relative merits of using an estimate, a survey or a Special Census. George Pettit asked Peggy Carpenter if Scottsdale had a particular position on the option to pursue. Ms. Carpenter indicated that she hadn't conferred with the Scottsdale Manager on the issue yet; and would discuss the matter with her.

Charlie McClendon pointed out that distributing the cost based on the share of population would be preferable to the smaller cities and that it would help achieve a regional consensus. It was also noted that in the past the cost of the Special Census has been allocated based on population.

It was agreed by consensus that the Subcommittee supported MAG pursuing a Census Survey at 95 percent accuracy plus/minus 2 percent to derive 2005 population figures for distributing state-shared revenue; and that the cost of conducting the survey would be distributed based upon 2005 population. It was also noted that any jurisdiction that wanted a higher accuracy level (plus/minus 1 percent) could do so and pay the additional cost associated with the higher accuracy level.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

**Comparison of
Net Survey Cost at 95% Confidence Interval +/- 2%
Net Survey Cost at 95% Confidence Interval +/- 1%
and
Net Special Census Cost**

Jurisdiction	Net survey cost based on share of housing unit sample (after FHWA contribution)		Net survey cost based on share of 2005 population (after FHWA contribution)		Net 2005 Special Census cost based on share of 2005 population (after FHWA contribution)
	95% +/- 2%	95% +/- 1%	95% +/- 2%	95% +/- 1%	
Avondale	\$138,800	\$430,500	\$92,000	\$258,400	\$469,800
Buckeye	\$128,100	\$128,300	\$25,100	\$70,600	\$128,300
Carefree	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$4,500	\$12,600	\$23,000
Cave Creek	\$29,500	\$29,500	\$5,800	\$16,200	\$29,500
Chandler	\$202,300	\$711,700	\$286,900	\$805,600	\$1,464,800
El Mirage	\$136,000	\$136,000	\$26,600	\$74,800	\$136,000
Fountain Hills	\$157,600	\$158,200	\$31,000	\$87,000	\$158,200
Gila Bend	\$13,600	\$13,600	\$2,700	\$7,500	\$13,600
Gilbert	\$146,700	\$535,600	\$228,300	\$641,200	\$1,165,800
Glendale	\$203,400	\$724,800	\$309,100	\$868,100	\$1,578,400
Goodyear	\$140,800	\$288,600	\$56,500	\$158,700	\$288,600
Guadalupe	\$35,900	\$35,900	\$7,000	\$19,700	\$35,900
Litchfield Park	\$25,600	\$25,600	\$5,000	\$14,100	\$25,600
Mesa	\$604,600	\$1,285,600	\$612,600	\$1,720,600	\$3,128,300
Paradise Valley	\$96,600	\$96,600	\$18,900	\$53,100	\$96,600
Peoria	\$205,200	\$684,500	\$190,100	\$534,000	\$970,900
Phoenix	\$1,189,500	\$4,397,200	\$1,840,400	\$5,168,700	\$9,397,600
Queen Creek	\$54,800	\$54,800	\$10,700	\$30,100	\$54,800
Scottsdale	\$261,000	\$981,900	\$297,600	\$835,700	\$1,519,500
Surprise	\$277,600	\$512,700	\$100,400	\$282,000	\$512,700
Tempe	\$206,300	\$712,300	\$206,300	\$579,300	\$1,053,300
Tolleson	\$33,900	\$33,900	\$6,600	\$18,600	\$33,900
Wickenburg	\$40,400	\$40,400	\$7,900	\$22,200	\$40,400
Youngtown	\$24,600	\$24,600	\$4,800	\$13,500	\$24,600
Balance of County	\$324,300	\$1,134,200	\$323,100	\$907,500	\$1,650,000
Total	\$4,700,100	\$13,200,000	\$4,700,000	\$13,200,000	\$24,000,000
Balance of County = Unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community					